

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

JERRY L. PENNAMON,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED BANK,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

**Civil Action No.
5:09-CV-169 (CAR)**

ORDER ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Before the Court are Plaintiff's *pro se* Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 5] and the two amendments thereto [Docs. 6 & 7] wherein Plaintiff seeks to have this Court reconsider its Order on Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* [Doc.3] in which the Court dismissed Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) for failure to state a claim. Local Rule 7.6 contemplates motions like the one at bar but warns that "Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice." Such motions are only appropriate if the movant can show: "(1) there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) new evidence has been discovered that was not previously available to the parties at the time the original order was entered, or (3) reconsideration is necessary to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice." Wallace v. Georgia Department of Transp., 2006 WL 1582409 * 2 (M.D.Ga. June 6, 2006) (slip copy) (citing McCoy v. Macon Water Auth., 966 F.Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D.Ga.1997)). "[A] motion for reconsideration does not provide an opportunity to simply reargue an issue the Court has once determined." Id. (quoting Am. Ass'n of People with

Disabilities v. Hood, 278 F.Supp.2d. 1337, 1340 (M.D. Fla. 2003) (quotation and citation omitted). Inasmuch, “[c]ourt opinions are not intended as mere first drafts, subject to revision and reconsideration at a litigant's pleasure.” Id.

Not only are Plaintiff’s Motions untimely, filed outside the ten day window under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), but they also fail to meet any of the standards discussed above. The Motions at bar are thus without merit and reconsideration is not warranted in this circumstance. Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 5] and the two amendments thereto [Docs. 6 & 7] are thus **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 28th day of July, 2009.

S/ C. Ashley Royal
C. ASHLEY ROYAL, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SSH